

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 12, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, and 11-14 are hereby amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently pending for prosecution on the merits. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 2, 6, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Office Action at p., ¶¶ 2-5. Applicant has amended the above mentioned claims in order to remove any purported indefiniteness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2, 6, and 12.

The Office has rejected claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,520,025 to Joo et al. (hereinafter *Joo*), in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,974 to Lyu et al. (hereinafter *Lyu*). Office Action at p. 3, ¶ 8.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that *Joo* and *Lyu* fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, at least a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office asserts that “*Joo* et al teach a method for washing laundry in a washing machine comprising the step of introducing a first amount of water, detergent and second amount of water (read as predetermined amounts of washing water and detergent according to an amount of the laundry.” Office Action at p. 3, ¶ 8. *Joo*, however, discloses that during the first water supply time:

micom 200 opens water introducing valve 120... to continuously introduce water into washing tank 100. Simultaneously, micom 200 sends a rotation order signal... to thereby drive motor 150... [t]he driving force of motor 150 is transferred to rotary blade 110 in washing tank 100 so that rotary blade 110 rotates to generate a water stream... [d]ue to the water stream the detergent is mixed with the washing water so that the detergent is diluted. *Joo* at col.6, ll. 4-14. (emphasis added)

Joo positively teaches that the first water amount is added simultaneously as the rotary blade is rotated in order to dilute the detergent in the washing water. However, *Joo* fails to disclose the claimed method comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1. In fact *Joo* teaches away from the claimed invention since *Joo* discloses it is necessary to rotate the rotary blade simultaneously while adding the first amount of water. Any modification of *Joo* to arrive at the claimed invention would result in rendering *Joo* unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Lyu fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo*. Indeed, *Lyu* was cited by the Office for its purported teaching of a washing machine having an inner and outer tub.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, alone or in combination with *Lyu*. Claims 2, 5, and 7-9, which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 are also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-9.

The Office has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu* in view of WO 03/080916 to Park (hereinafter *Park*). Office Action at p. 7, ¶ 9.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Park* fail to disclose, alone or in combination, at least a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force,

wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1. *Park* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo* and *Lyu*. Indeed, *Park* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of mixing the supplied washing water and the detergent with the laundry.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Park*, alone or in combination. Claim 3, which depends directly from claim 1 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 3.

The Office has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Park* in view of U.S. Patent 6,257,027 to Imai (hereinafter *Imai*). Office Action at p. 8, ¶ 10.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu*, *Park* and *Imai* fail to disclose, alone or in combination, at least a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1. *Imai* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo*, *Lyu*, *Park*, and. Indeed, *Imai* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotating the motor repeatedly in opposite directions alternately.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, *Park*, and *Imai*, alone or in combination. Claim 4, which depends indirectly from claim 1 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4.

The Office has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu*, in view of U.S. Patent 5,520,025 to Sonoda et al. (hereinafter *Sonoda*). Office Action at p. 8, ¶ 11.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Sonoda* fail to disclose, alone or in combination, at least a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1. *Sonoda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo* and *Lyu*. Indeed, *Sonoda* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotating a motor in a direction opposite the direction of rotation.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Sonoda*, alone or in combination. Claim 6, which depends indirectly from claim 1 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 6.

The Office has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu*, in view of JP 2003-10587 to Hitachi (hereinafter *Hitachi*). Office Action at p. 9, ¶ 12.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Hitachi* fail to disclose, alone or in combination, at least a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, “rotating the inner tub and a pulsator in the inner tub at a predetermined speed by a motor, to wash the laundry by a centrifugal force, wherein the rotating occurs after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before the supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 1. *Hitachi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo* and *Lyu*. Indeed, *Hitachi* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotatively driving an agitation blade “in such a manner that the tub... is made free to rotate so that reaction forces reverse to the driving force of the agitation blade.” Office Action at p.10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Hitachi*, alone or in combination. Claim 10, which depends indirectly from claim 1 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 10.

The Office has rejected claim 11, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu* in view of *Park*. Office Action at p. 10, ¶ 13.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu* and *Park* fail to disclose, alone or in combination a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, at least, “rotating the inner tub and the pulsator in the inner tub in one direction at a predetermined speed by a motor after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 11.

Referring to the discussion above regarding claim 1, which recites similar limitations to independent claim 11, Applicant asserts that *Joo* fails to disclose the claimed invention for substantially the same reasons. *Lyu* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo*. Indeed, *Lyu* was cited by the Office for its purported teaching of a washing machine having an inner and outer tub. Further, *Park* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo* and *Lyu*. Indeed, *Park* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of mixing the supplied washing water and the detergent with the laundry.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, and *Park*, alone or in combination. Claims 13-16, which depend both directly and indirectly from claim 11 are also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 11 and 13-16.

The Office has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu* in view of *Park* and *Sonoda*. Office Action at p. 14, ¶ 14.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu* and *Park* fail to disclose, alone or in combination, a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, at least, “rotating the inner tub and the pulsator in the inner tub in one direction at a predetermined speed by a motor after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 11. *Sonoda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo*, *Lyu* and *Park*. Indeed, *Sonoda* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotating a motor in a direction opposite the direction of rotation.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo*, *Lyu*, *Park*, and *Sonoda*, alone or in combination. Claim 12, which depends directly from claim 11 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 12.

The Office has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Joo*, and *Lyu* in view of *Park* and *Hitachi*. Office Action at p. 15, ¶ 15.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and asserts that *Joo*, *Lyu* and *Park* fail to disclose, alone or in combination a method for washing laundry in a washing machine having an inner tub and an outer tub comprising, at least, “rotating the inner tub and the pulsator in the inner tub in one direction at a predetermined speed by a motor after completing the supplying of the first washing water amount and before supplying of the second washing water amount,” as recited in independent claim 11. *Hitachi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Joo*, *Lyu* and *Park*. Indeed, *Hitachi* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotating a motor in a direction opposite the direction of rotation.

Indeed, *Hitachi* was set forth by the Office for its purported teaching of rotatively driving an agitation blade “in such a manner that the tub... is made free to rotate so that reaction forces reverse to the driving force of the agitation blade.” Office Action at p.15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over *Joo, Lyu, Park*, and *Hitachi*, alone or in combination. Claim 17, which depends directly from claim 11 is also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 17.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael R. Kresloff (Reg. No. 46,522)

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant